

REMARKS:

Claims 1-5 are in the case and presented for consideration.

Applicant affirms the election of claims 1-5 and claims 6-13 have been cancelled subject to applicant right to file a divisional application covering these claims.

The specification has been amended to include conventional headings and claim 4 has been amended in view of the examiner's rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The specification and claims are therefore now believed to be in proper form under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The examiner has also rejected claims 1, 3 and 5 as being obvious from the reference to Xu with claim 2 being rejected as obvious from Xu in view of Nishikawa.

The claimed invention deals with the problem of sudden stops of the injection process when a guarding device is opened by the staff servicing the injection moulding machine. These stops are performed for security purposes and are connected to the problem that the single phase solution of polymer and propellant breaks down and becomes unusable. The whole teaching of Xu (U.S. Patent 6,322,347) is not dedicated to the problem of what to do with the single phase solution when the normal injection process is stopped. Throughout the whole specification of that patent, it is only the "normal" injection process which is discussed. Therefore, no one skilled in the art can learn anything on how to handle the problem which is solved by the subject invention.

Even if the problem of what to do in case of a security stop of the injection moulding process were discussed in Xu, the solution of how to handle this problem would be distinct from the subject invention. Xu teaches that it is necessary to have a restriction element upstream of a blowing agent injection port to maintain the single phase solution of polymer

and blowing agent. This means that it only can be learned from Xu that it is necessary to have an additional part (the restriction element) arranged on the screw. In contrast, the problem posed by the present application is not in need of any additional parts arranged on the screw. The invention here teaches that it is sufficient to limit the maximum speed of displacement of the screw arranged in the plasticising cylinder.

In summary, the Xu patent does not deal with the problem to be solved by the present invention and is, in addition, not able to anticipate the claimed solution of the problem. Therefore, the claims are believed to be patentable over Xu. Dependent claims 2-5 distinguish the invention further and are likewise believed to be in condition for allowance.

In particular, Nishikawa adds insufficient additional teachings to render claim 2 obvious.

By this amendment thus the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter C. Michalos
Reg. No. 28,643
Attorney for Applicants
(845) 359-7700

Dated: December 9, 2003

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706